

**CALIFORNIA RECREATIONAL TRAILS COMMITTEE  
TRANSCRIPT**

**Moderator: Cheryl Essex  
December 15, 2010  
Noon**

NOTE: This transcript has not been checked for accuracy against the audio recording of the meeting and is therefore not to be used as an official record. The minutes of the meeting constitute the official record. This transcript is provided as a courtesy only. Passages may be inaccurate, and names of places and people may be misspelled. This transcript shall not be quoted without first verifying the accuracy of the transcription against the audio recording of the meeting and confirming the information with the California Department of Parks and Recreation.

Crosstalk...

Cheryl:

We're going to begin recording very shortly so you may want to let folks know.

Crosstalk...

John Mercurio:

I'd like to call this scheduled meeting of the California Recreational Trails Committee to order on Wednesday, December 15, 2010. What I'd like to do first is to go down - we have a number of different sites around the state. It looks like there're five different locations around California where this meeting is being held. Gee, what a nice simple way to have a meeting, huh?

And I'd like to just go down the line and find out who's there and how many public are present in each location. And if possible also to find out how many public in each location are interested in speaking so we can do a reasonable time allocation for each speaker.

So I'd like to start with Sacramento. (I think)...

Cheryl:

(John), we have 21 members of the public here right now and five people that have indicated they'd like to speak.

John Mercurio:

Okay. And I'd also like to have the participating staff and committee members introduce themselves as well.

Wayne Breece:

From Sacramento, this is Wayne Breece, executive secretary for the California Recreational Trails Committee.

Cathy Haagensmit:

This is Cathy Haagensmit. I'm a member of the California Recreational Trails Committee. I've been a member since 2009. I'm an avid mountain biker and hiker. And I live near Auburn.

Cheryl Essex:

I'm Cheryl Essex. I'm assistant executive secretary of the Committee. I wanted to just remind everyone that this meeting is being recorded and transcribed. Thank you.

Gary Walter:

I'm Gary Walter and I'm manager of the resource services section of the northern service center for state parks. We handle most of the facilities development environmental documentation.

Heidi West:

I'm Heidi West. I'm an environmental coordinator at the California State Parks northern service center and work with Gary Walter.

Cheryl Essex:

That's it for Sacramento.

John Mercurio:

Okay thank you. Carpinteria, hello.

Gregory Gandrud:

Hello Chairman Mercurio. This is Gregory Gandrud. I'm a member of the California Recreational Trails Committee. We do not yet have any members of the public with us here in Carpinteria.

John Mercurio:

Thank you Gregory. Tehachapi district office in Lancaster.

Jeannie Gillen:

Hi. This is Jeannie Gillen at the Tehachapi district office. We do not have any members of the public here.

John Mercurio: Okay and San Diego.

Maryanne Vancio: Hi. This is Maryanne Vancio and David March and we have two members of the public here.

John Mercurio: Do we know if they're - they plan on speaking?

Maryanne Vancio: Neither? No.

John Mercurio: No. They do not?

Maryanne Vancio: No, not at this time anyway.

John Mercurio: Okay. Very good. And I'm John Mercurio. I'm from Concord. I'm up here on the summit of Mt. Diablo. And we have no public - we have one public here but he has not indicated interest in speaking at this time.

Cheryl Essex: I'm not sure if David had a chance to introduce himself.

David March: Why thank you Cheryl. David March is my name. I'm down here with Maryanne in the San Diego office and I am a hiker and backpacker. I've hiked roughly 1000 miles of the Pacific Crest trail which isn't all of it by any stretch. But I was tired. And I am a member of the California Recreational Trails Committee.

John Mercurio: Thank you. We're on Item 3 now on the agenda which is committee advice for state park director about the scope of the programmatic environmental impact report for roads and trails, change in use.

Cheryl Essex: John, did you want to mention anything about our schedules today?

John Mercurio: Yes, I would. We - because there's a limited amount of time available there was a need to end this meeting by noon. (I've) allocated the time roughly as follows - about one hour for the PEIR, about a half hour for the trail plan progress report which will leave us about a half hour for public comment.

So when we get to the - well, it looks like we're going to have probably if it stays the way it is, I'll probably be able to allow about three minutes per person for public comment. And we're going to request and if there's a - two people from the same group and you're going to say the same thing, you consolidate your comments and have one person instead of two, you know, make the comment to us. So that's the deal with the time allocation.

Gregory Gandrud: Chairman Mercurio, this is Gregory Gandrud. I have a schedule conflict and will need to depart at 11:30 at the latest.

John Mercurio: Okay.

Gregory Gandrud: But I was thinking if the committee is going to provide advice to the state park director, I would like to hear some comment from the public relevant to that prior to the committee making its comments to the state park director if we could please.

John Mercurio: Yes. Wayne, could you address that please?

Wayne Breece: Well we've got this time on the schedule set aside for that last part for public comment. This first section of the agenda is an opportunity for you, as the committee, should you want to, to discuss this and for you to, you know, discuss a PEIR or making any comments for you. That's you're only opportunity really as a group to be able to do that.

Jeannie Gillen: Well this is Jeannie Gillen and I wanted to add to what Greg's saying. I, too, would like to hear from the public before I make a recommendation to the director. So I'm wondering if we can move public comment up a little sooner.

John Mercurio: Well, from what I've been told, we can't.

Jeannie Gillen: We can't.

John Mercurio: That's the way it is.

Gregory Gandrud: It's your meeting, John.

Jeannie Gillen: Yes, why can't we?

Gregory Gandrud: It's your meeting to run.

John Mercurio: Well, then why didn't we set it up that way in the first place? I mean...

Gregory Gandrud: If you as a committee, want to discuss this and entertain comments, that's your choice.

John Mercurio: Well, that's not the way I understood it. It sounded to me like the law required us to do it the way it's set up but if we have a chance to have people speak along with an agenda item instead of at the end, I'd much rather have it that way too. So I'm in agreement with Jeannie and Gregory.

Gregory Gandrud: This is Greg. Just one other thing. I think we can differentiate between public comment about matters which are not on the agenda versus public comment on matters which are on the agenda. And I think it's very appropriate to take...

John Mercurio: It's the more normal way to do it. That's right. So what we'll do is we'll have - I'd like to have it - I'd like to have the committee discuss this and then open it up for comments related to the (PEIR) and then close that comment period and then come up with specific items that we want to direct to Director (Coleman).

Then at the end of the meeting we can have public comment on anything else that's not on the agenda. Does that sound all right?

Jeannie Gillen: Thank you John. That sounds good.

John Mercurio: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Essex: (Do we have) a motion on the floor?

Jeannie Gillen: Yes.

Gregory Gandrud: I'll move that. It's Gregory Gandrud. I don't know if we have to have a motion for that but I'm in agreement with the chair's decision.

John Mercurio: Good. Do we have a second?

Jeannie Gillen: Yes. This is Jeannie. That's a second.

John Mercurio: Okay. All in favor. Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Woman: Aye.

Man: Aye.

John Mercurio: Opposed?

Cheryl Essex: It sounds like it's unanimous.

John Mercurio: It sounds like it's unanimous. That's the way it sounds.

Woman: Great.

Woman: We'll do that.

John Mercurio: Okay so we'll do that. So now is there some - let's see now. Again, I want to kind of emphasize what Wayne Breece had said is that the opportunity for direct comments to the prepar- to the (PEIR) staff is actually closed. So this meeting is really set up for the - it's the only opportunity that the California Recreational Trails Committee has to discuss it and come up with comments that they might want to direct the director.

But we are going to allow brief comments to be made by the public to help us. And also there are other opportunities to make comments and I'll let staff do that at some point later on, how you might direct written comments I guess to the director on this.

So - and also, okay just I'll also emphasize that the product of this meeting, we're trying to do - come up with a letter written by a CRTC committee member to be determined and (signed) by that person and directed at Director (Coleman).

That will incorporate any comments that we would like to suggest, things that we would like to make.

So now at this point is there a staff - any staff presentation to - about this?

Gary Walter: Yes, this is Gary Walter and...

John Mercurio: Hi Gary.

Gary Walter: Hi. I prepared the information paper that was sent out to all the committee members I believe. I - last year I was requested by our legal council to start looking into preparing a programmatic EIR for the change in use program that had been formulated I believe in 2008 in response to a (unintelligible) notice.

Because we had never engaged in a programmatic EIR before, we contracted with a consultant, (Accent) Environmental Incorporated, who has prepared programmatic EIRs. And so they're engaged with us in preparing this document. We got that - we prepared a project description which essentially is an - a description of features that will be used when district superintendents are presented with a proposal to change use in trails.

And that change in use may be either a request for additional user types using a trail. It may be a request (for reduction) of user types using particular trails. It may be a request for the elimination of a trail for any apparent reason.

Prior to that, in 1988, we had a departmental notice that said, okay, we're going to consider opening up trails for multiple uses but district superintendent, it's your job to do that. And you have to make that evaluation.

In 2008, it came clear that there weren't a whole lot of trails being addressed and there was a lot of confusion and there was no consistency throughout the department in terms of how this was supposed to happen.

And so they - we - or the roads and trail people along with legal were challenged with preparing this change in use procedure and the process for that is on the project Web site. With that essentially in a nutshell it is - the district superintendent receives a proposal for a change in use either from a member of the public, a member from a user group, or a member of staff.

They have certain - a certain procedure that they have to follow. They give it - they give that proposal to a person who has been trained and is knowledgeable about trails, trails conditions. They're sent out to survey every inch of that trail to look for potential safety conflicts, potential erosion conflicts, other things that may need to be addressed on that trail in order to make a change in use practical and come back with a recommendation or with a report actually.

It's a survey that they could complete, a (log), the trail (log). Then the district superintendent convenes a district staff meeting where this is presented and that includes the resource people, the maintenance people, the safety people. And they all review this and then they come up with a recommendation on how to proceed with this, with the request.

From there, the determination is made as to which recommendation it is. Then at that point, they're to go to various trail user groups if it's determined that, hey, this is - this may be a good idea to get input.

Once that is achieved and it makes it through that process, then it goes through a level of sequel review for site specific impacts. And then from there it is determined if there needs to be a mitigated (Nagdac), an EIR, what type of compliance may need to be done.

And once that is achieved, then it goes through the whole public review process on towards implementation. Two years down the road now, after this procedure came out, it's pretty much come clear to the department and (they) feel that, you know, we're not really deploying this in an effective manner that effects cumulative impacts and those types of things and it appears that, you know, if we were to adopt a programmatic EIR which is encouraged under these types of situations by (Sequa) because it addresses a chain of actions that are all related into the same program.

But if we adopted a programmatic we could address all the broad issues and look towards potential mitigations that we can employ on a broad scale issue, okay. So, alas, we're doing this programmatic EIR.

The purpose of the programmatic EIR, again, is it - you know, it looks at all these issues, it analyzes them, it includes things like issues dealing with biology, with endangered species, with erosion sedimentation, user safety, those types of things - recreation, if a trail is to be taken out of circulation and restored.

So then this - once this programmatic EIR is finished and is certified then it contains all the information, all this background information anyway, that is - if a site specific project is then proposed and it makes it through all the procedural (use) and it gets to the secondary (sequa) stage. Then they look at a checklist that comes out of the programmatic EIR and they compare that with their review of the project to determine if there're impacts with their project that'll have - that have been addressed in the programmatic EIR.

If there are - if there are no new impacts that have been determined through the program or through the environmental review process, then they can adopt a finding that they're within the whole scope of the program EIR and they don't need to do any further environmental review.

Operator: Excuse me. (Kathy Campbell) joined.

Gary Walter: Okay. So if they're not - if they have a new impact and it's not addressed in the programmatic EIR, then they have to readdress CEQA. They have to do another environmental document. However, they can tier off of the programmatic such that they can rely on all of the impacts that have been addressed in the programmatic and focus primarily on the new impact in their document, okay.

Deleted: John Mercurio:

And in accepting this and in performing this secondary CEQA review, they...

Coordinator: (Pardon). Excuse me. (Sue Schwartz) joins.

Gary Walter: They still need to adopt all the mitigation measures and standard project requirements that are addressed under the programmatic EIR. So there's still obliged to do that. They have to form this check off list to make sure they've covered everything. If there's anything new they have to do another document.

So in a nutshell, that's what the programmatic EIR is all about. We filed a notice of preparation for this with the state clearinghouse early in September. We scheduled two public workshops, one in Northern California, one in Southern California. We made a mistake and scheduled the one in Southern California on a religious holiday and so we cancelled that and had another day scheduled and we completed both of those workshops.

We took comments. We outlined what the programmatic EIR is all about. The notice of preparation period is typically 30 days. In this case it went from September 7 until November 30 so it was a rather lengthy notice of preparation period.

And we received several comments. We just compiled them yesterday so I haven't had much of a chance to review those comments. We just sent them over to our consultant who is going to be cataloging them all and preparing a cohesive document for us to follow.

So we're at that stage right now where we're just taking this information in so that we can fill out the scope of what this document will include. In these workshops that we had, we asked the - were scoping workshops and we're asking members of the public and agencies if there were any, specifically if they had any information or comments that they could lend towards helping us determine what types of effects we may need to cover under this programmatic EIR, what potential mitigation measures there may be, what the range of actions should include when we're performing these types of changes in use.

You know, what alternatives are available that they think need to be considered. So it's - and so that was the purpose of those hearings. So now we're going to take those comments once they're all cataloged and start determining a game plan for how we're going to develop this programmatic EIR.

John Mercurio: Okay well thank you. I - my comment on all that is that this is - I've personally been involved with some (sequa) issues in various ways both as a staff person and as a commissioner and a committee member in various ways and this - I've never dealt with a program EIR before and it's - I have to admit it's a little difficult. It's kind of an abstract thing to me. That's my impression.

Kind of hard to get your brain around it but we're going to try here and I think...

John Mercurio: If there're no other comments from staff in Sacramento, I think it's - I'd like to open it up to the committee members. Is there anything else from Sacramento?

Cathy Yes, John, this is Cathy. I'm here in Sacramento. And I'm - thank you Greg. That was great. One of the questions I have is it sounds like John might be curious about an answer to this too is, do you know of other land management agencies that are using a programmatic EIR for...

Man: Part of an agriculture system.

Cathy Like the forest service?

John Mercurio: No, state department of agriculture.

Cathy Oh okay.

John Mercurio: On some of their spray programs.

Woman: The Department of the Land and Water has one as well.

Cathy Oh okay. And it's - does it sound like other agencies are going in this direction to try to relief some of the cumbersome agenda and processes that might exist?

John Mercurio: I'm not aware of whether any of the departments....

Cathy: When you go district to district?

John Mercurio: ...are doing any - as far as within the Department of Parks and Recreation, presently I'm not aware of any others that are at least being prepared. There's been the idea of preparing one for the use of pesticides that's been bantered about but I - it hasn't gained any traction yet that I'm aware of.

Cathy: Thank you.

Maryanne Vancio: This is Maryanne. Cathy, why were you asking that question just out of curiosity?

Cathy: Well, see, I was just wondering if it was a way to try to move agencies to make more efficient processes, introduce more efficient processes in the way they do business. It's just a - budgets are so tight these days and I can't - I just don't see any relief at any time in the future and it would just be interesting to see if it was a method of trying to relieve some of the budget burdens. But it sounds like, you know, this is a first. So - for like a recreational agency which sounds, you know, really interesting to see if we can assist and move this forward at all.

Maryanne, since you work for a county park, do you see any benefit?

Maryanne Vancio: I was just comparing it to - I was talking to (David) earlier, that when the county of San Diego developed its county trails program, our direction from county council was to do a mitigated (neg dep). I mean, basically we presented them a program and, you know, the program does not have any impacts on the environment because it's a written document.

But we knew that our intent of approving the program was to actually put trails on the ground and we knew that, you know, there would be some impact. So we just, you know, kind of skipped that and went straight to the mitigated (neg dep) and said, you know, our plan is if there're any impacts, this is how we're going to mitigate and, you know, basically our mitigation was to avoid any impacts.

But we knew that, you know, with San Diego county being as diverse as it is, we were bound to run into it. And so at that time we said, you know, if we have these impacts to repair (any) areas or to (oak) woodlands or, you know, flood plains, you know, this is how we're going to mitigate it based on (sequa).

So we just kind of skipped that, you know, programmatic and went straight to the mitigated (neg dep) and that - said that was our direction from county council. And it worked really well for us.

John Mercurio: This is John. You know, that's a - the idea here is that there are going to be situations where there will be mitigated neg decs on these proposed changes but the base level is to use the PEIR process and hopefully accommodate, you know, most of the projects or some - let's just say, some proportion of the project. But there is a mechanism, you know, in CEQA obviously to do a mitigated neg dec and also there may even be a necessity to do an actual EIR in some (instances).

Woman: Yes.

John Mercurio: So these things are not - it's not (moved) from the process. It's just you basically have different levels.

Maryanne Vancio: Right. Exactly.

John Mercurio: And also what I wanted - another point I wanted to make out there is that I fully appreciate Cathy's comment on streamlining. But, you know, the other thing here is that when you have a program that's in place throughout an entire state like California, what you then introduce is a program that's consistent and uniform and clear.

And it's the same process throughout the state. Rather than is kind of fragmented thing where in one district it's done one way, another district another way, and if a particular individual or group is working in - across different districts, they're scratching their heads wondering why is this one way and why is this another way in a different district, you know.

So I really appreciate the fact that we're going to have something that's laid out clear, it's going to be uniform and consistent. I think that really is the most important thing here.

Woman: I think so.

Man: I don't know.

Woman: I agree with you John.

John Mercurio: Yes.

Cathy: I do too. This is Cathy. I completely agree that resolving some recurring questions and redundancies that happen in the first tier and making it a department wide so that there's more - more consistent decisions are made and clarifying confusion is really (awesome) about this process.

Jeannie Gillen: This is Jeannie. I have a question. And I agree with a lot of what has been said that this is an effort to streamline, be more efficient and be more consistent across the state. But again, I think I heard that it does kind of go back to the district superintendent which is not much different then the way it was originally set up.

But my specific question would be when Gary was talking - I think it was Gary - said that one of the parts of the process was that the district superintendent convenes a staff meeting for review of the request for change and I want to know if the person or organization that requests that change is involved in that meeting.

Gary Walter: The meeting that I was referring to I believe was at the point where the person that was assigned to make the travel - or I mean the trail log comes back and meets with members of the district's staff to review his findings and make a recommendation to the district superintendent.

And then the district superintendent, along with his staff, at that point provides this recommendation to different user groups to get their input.

Jeannie Gillen: Okay. Thank you.

Woman: Yes, Jeannie, that's a great point about the - sort of the concerns that the public be provided - public input opportunities during the process. It sounds like they've - a lot of thought has been going into providing the public opportunities to comment and I think in one of the statements that we got, the staff has been determined to consider public input and they consider it very vital to the whole...

Jeannie Gillen: Well, we do hear that. This is Jeannie again. We do hear that and that is the way the process works but how much recognition or opportunity the public has to actually influence the decisions when the decisions are being made is what concerns me. And a good example would be that we're doing this today but we don't have the results from the public comment input at the workshop. So it's almost like we're saying it but we're not doing it.

John Mercurio: Yes I understand. This is John. Yes, I understand that. I noticed that too but I guess we're going to have to do our best just to come up with comments, you know, just (on) discussion today.

Maryanne Vancio: This is Maryanne. I have a question and maybe it's for the environmental staff with the state parks. But I'm assuming that this program is only going to affect state park units. I have two questions. Would there be any - will there be any of this program and the programmatic EIR, will it provide any assistance for local agencies that want to do the same thing?

I mean, would we be able to use that EIR in any way to, you know, help us do a change in use within, you know, local parks? And then my other question is that if you're only - if it only addresses the change in use in state park units, how does this affect or not affect the California riding and hiking trail?

Gary: Well, those are both good questions and I - as it's written up in the project description we're just addressing units of the state park system. And also it's really not affecting OHV units because OHV units are a whole different animal.

In regards to the state trail, it would affect those parts of the trail that are in state park units.

Maryanne Vancio: I'm sorry. I missed that last part. Can you say that again?

Wayne: It would affect the state - the trail that you were referring to...

Woman: The riding and hiking...

Maryanne Vancio: The California riding and hiking trail.

Wayne: Yes. In those aspects of - or those portions of the trails would occur in state parks.

Maryanne Vancio: Okay so will that - I realize that but what about sections of the trail that the state still has easements to that are not within a park unit?

Wayne: I think that that would probably need to be evaluated. I don't have an answer for that. I...

Maryanne Vancio: Okay. That's okay. Thank you.

John Mercurio: Okay thank you. Are there any other questions from other committee members of staff in Sacramento? Are there - okay, why don't we have some discussion now from - let me just go around to - in Sacramento, Cathy, do you have any comments to make?

Cathy: Oh I'm - I just wanted to reiterate that, you know, right now it's a cumbersome confusing process. It wastes some really precious resources that the department has and the parks superintendents have. It's not a perfect process now and it may never be a perfect process but this seems like a really good move in the right direction to improve the way things are going and up until November 30, the scoping that was - that's been done was excellent.

And I think state parks did a really good job starting with the Trails and Greenways Conference. I wanted to thank state parks for being there to introduce the programmatic EIR program. And then to continue, you know, I was able after the conference to go back to my constituency and talk to my friends and the people I work with on trails to get some ideas and most people had some pretty (sort of) - a lot of support for this, making a change.

That - the public comment period was closed November 30. I think it sounds like a lot of comments were received and, of course, we haven't seen them today but I think a lot of us probably have heard over the course of the summer from some people on some of the comments that they might've had. After this it'll go to the draft and people will have a chance to comment on that.

That'll be interesting to see but my first thought here that the CRTC should support the department in this move toward the programmatic EIR.

John Mercurio: Okay well thank you Cathy and thanks, too, for reminding us about the discussion that was had - the presentation and discussion that was had at the Trails and Greenways Conference which kind of introduced this. And so there was, you know, some of the real active people in the trails community who were at the conference and who had an interest in this were participating in this.

So that's great too. Thanks for reminding us. Let's go over to Carpenteria now and see if Gregory has any comments.

Gregory Gandrud: Hi. This is Gregory Gandrud. We have one member of the public who's joined us here and I was wondering, do we have any public comments that we want to hear prior to the committee giving advice to the state park director?

John Mercurio: We - I was going to have the committee members first speak and then have the public comment and then we'll bring it back to the committee.

Gregory Gandrud: Okay. You know, I just keep thinking about what an enormous budget deficit we're facing here in California not just of this year but future fiscal years. And we just need to be so very sensitive to that fact.

And I also want to reflect back on the whole reason that the change of use got started was because we do have different user groups who want to share our trails and the committee felt that objectivity was extremely important in any change of use.

So I really support the idea of having change of use survey as a tool to use prior to changing how our trails are shared. So to the extent that the programmatic EIR helps us to save money, I think it's great. To the extent that it's objective, I think it's great.

I'm wondering, you know, if perhaps we do have too much process, though, in California and perhaps we ought to consider at some point finding a way for - finding a way to reduce the amount of process. Maybe trails should be exempt from CEQA. So just my thought.

John Mercurio: Okay thank you Gregory. In Lancaster, Jeannie, anything?

Jeannie Gillen: Yes, this is Jeannie. And I, too, am a little concerned about too much process. I'm wondering if this layer of process is actually physically responsible or efficient. Are we adding more process and therefore adding more costs? So I'd like that to be on the table. I'd also like to be on the table, I haven't heard anything about how requests are prioritized.

You know, whose requests get to the front of the line for consideration when you go site specific. And then I do want to say I like the idea of consistency and change of use because I have been dealing with the change of use issue for all of the ten years that I've been on this committee. And I really like the idea of some consistency, but I feel very strongly that the public needs to be very involved and I'm not seeing enough of that.

John Mercurio: Do you want to (state) some of those points you made into formal questions to staff?

Jeannie Gillen: Sure.

John Mercurio: Can you do that and see if we can get an answer right now?

Jeannie Gillen: Sure.

John Mercurio: Okay go ahead.

Jeannie Gillen: The main one would be is this layering of process going to cost more money, to put it plain and simple?

Gary Walter: Well the idea is - this is Gary - when you approach something on a (programmatic) level...

Gary Walter: When you approach these topics on a broad scale, you're able to address most of them at this tier one level so that when independent of lower level projects actually come along, changing these projects actually come along, once they do their environmental review of that independent project, if they compare their findings to the checklist for the programmatic, they may find that everything has already been discussed and mitigated in the programmatic.

They can adopt a programmatic and they don't have to go to the extent and the time and the paperwork duplication of preparing another environmental document.

Jeannie Gillen: Can I interrupt you just to say that sounds great. That's a great answer and I hope that's the direction staff is trying to go. It just doesn't always happen. Sometimes the more you look the more you find to object to. So thank you for that answer.

My other question would be how do you prioritize your requests?

Gary Walter: I think that's a question for probably Wayne. There - his job is the one that developed the procedure.

Wayne Breece: Well Jeannie, I think there is a process of working with superintendents and working with the district there. Where you're seeing a lot of incidents or you're seeing a lot of requests or you're seeing things that are happening that are degrading the environment of the trail or you're seeing accidents, I think those things are at the top of the priority for a superintendent.

And they need to take the appropriate actions. And again, that's going to be very site specific or park specific.

Jeannie Gillen: That sounds good. Thank you Wayne.

John Mercurio: Yes, it sounds like, you know, if a change (use) is in response to a safety issue that one's going right to the top naturally as it should and then everything else is just a discussion.

But - okay, so you got the answers Jeannie. You understand a little bit better now?

Jeannie Gillen: I did and I appreciate that time. Thank you.

John Mercurio: Okay great. Now down in San Diego, first David and then Maryanne. David.

David March: Yes, Dave March here. I guess I'm hung up with a couple three other people that there is - it smacks of being another layer. You can hear some poor person in his cubicle saying, "Oh my God." And I would hope very much that we find a way to simplify, simplify because that deals with the concern that a couple three people have expressed about the budgetary constraints that we find ourselves in whether we like it or not.

And that's not going to go away. So that's my reaction. I'm still sitting here pretty skeptical that we're moving in the right direction. At least we are moving and that draws attention to things and makes things happen in and of itself, just to be doing something.

And that pushes us all to think more carefully which is a good thing and that'll probably summarize the overall impression that I have thus far this morning.

John Mercurio: Okay thank you. And Maryanne?

Maryanne Vancio: Yes. First I'd like to say that the trail use change survey I think is a good idea. I think it might be a little much. It looks a little cumbersome but I've gone through it, you know, we've - the committee's gone through it in the past. But I think it's a good idea having requests here at the county all the time to, you know, add uses or take uses away from various parts or preserve trail systems.

So I think it's something really good and I probably will even suggest that our department adopt something similar to this. Having said that, yes, it will add more work and more process but in the long run when you have a problem or an accident or something happens and the public comes to you and says, "Well how come you made this change and you just, you know, do this without any thought." And we just say, "Yes, we did have thought and we did have a process," and we can show them the process.

Well I think that's good, you know, for all public agencies. I think the PEIR hopefully will save time and money is the change in use of various trails actually are exempt because of the PEIR. If it's an existing trail and you're adding an existing new use, hopefully there wouldn't be any more impacts and so nothing else needs to be done. They just adopt the PEIR and they go on their merry way.

If because of the change in use it finds that the trail needs to be relocated or, you know, a major rehab, then that obviously is going to add a lot more cost to the process and, you know, with an EIR or, you know, a full blown EIR or something else.

So I, you know, I mean I can see the benefits and I can also see the challenges but I think for what we're supposed to be evaluating I think that PEIR probably is a good way to go for the department.

John Mercurio: Thank you Maryanne. I guess I - I guess this kind of brings up a question that I'd like to address to Gary and that is that, you know, how accurate is the perception that this is another layer, I mean, because my way of looking at that - this - is that it's not an - actually another layer of analysis or review or bureaucracy or whatever word you want to use but it replaces a whole patchwork of other things that were being done around the state in different ways.

So can you clarify that? Is this another additional process that's going on or is it - does it pretty much generally replace what's already being done in a more uniform way?

Gary Walter: Well, in some regards it's similar to a general plan in that it's a tiered document. So, like, in a general plan it addresses, you know, a general plan will come forward with policies on the way that a particular government or a particular city operates.

This comes forward with the way that we're going to operate this procedure and it's going to provide how those actions will impact the environment. So in one respect it is another layer but when it comes

time to doing the projects that are under the umbrella of the programmatic, it may - it has a strong potential to reduce the lower levels because they would already be covered by the tier one document, the impact would already be covered.

So I know I sound like I'm talking out of both sides of my mouth and I guess in some respects I am, but I think, you know, because, you know, each individual project is different and California's a very varied state in terms of its environments.

And, you know, so each individual project has to be taken on its own merits. But in so far as it is overlaid by the programmatic EIR, then this has really good potential to save further (sequa) review and (sequa) process.

Jeannie Gillen: This is Jeannie. I have another question if I may.

John Mercurio: Sure. Go ahead.

Jeannie Gillen: Who is representing park superintendent today and how did they feel about this?

Gary: I have not received any feedback from district superintendents. I - we've been working primarily through the deputy director of operations who's pretty much given us the green light to do this project. So I don't know. Can you contribute to that Wayne?

Wayne Breece: Well I think that sometimes they aren't in this meeting. We do have representatives from state parks who are part of the trail process here today. But they are well aware of the process and I think they, as ones that I have talked to are - welcome this process.

It gives consistency. It gives accuracy. It gives a well studied thought out process. And it ensures they're making the right decision.

Jeannie Gillen: Because it's, you know, it does fall back on them.

Wayne Breece: That's true.

Jeannie Gillen: So why don't we have their opinion collected and presented to us?

Wayne Breece: I'm sure if they had been - they are welcome again to add to this process to make comments to it. And as it goes on in their districts they are very well involved in it and knowledgeable about what the suggestions are.

Jeannie Gillen: And you haven't had any negative feedback.

Wayne Breece: I haven't.

Jeannie Gillen: Okay. Does anyone else that you know of?

Woman: No.

Man: I haven't heard.

Jeannie Gillen: Okay. I guess if there was you'd probably hear it. Maybe. I mean, I'm thinking. Is this just a Sacramento thing or do you think you would hear it? Is there an avenue for you to hear of this or is it just handed down to them?

Wayne Breece: No we - I would hear about it.

Jeannie Gillen: Okay.

Wayne Breece: So they would call or write or visit.

Jeannie Gillen: Okay. Okay, thanks Wayne.

John Mercurio: Okay well thank you. It sounds like this is the time when we would entertain the input from the public. And Gregory, you said you had someone with you. Can you find out if that person would like to speak?

Gregory Gandrud: That person is not interested in speaking at this time. Thank you.

John Mercurio: And in Sacramento, we have five folks who would like to speak?

Cheryl Essex: I believe now - has everyone that wants to speak filled out a card and brought it to me? Okay, so I have eight people and it looks to me like four of them have actually identified trail use and so let me call out those names and also make sure that the other folks don't want to speak specifically on the PEIR.

That would be (Trina Romo), (Jerry Scribner), (Randi Hackforth) and (Donna Williams) speaking specifically on the change of use. I have (Dave Smith).

(Dave Smith): I want to speak on this.

Cheryl Essex: You want to speak on this too. (Joe Larkin).

(Joe Larkin): I don't know what I want to speak on yet.

Cheryl Essex: All right. Mark Ingleman.

(Mark Ingleman): Yes.

Cheryl Essex: You want to speak on this issue or...

(Mark Ingleman): Change of use conflicts. It would be the same thing (right now) because you're changing the trail use which would (instigate) conduct.

Cheryl Essex: Okay great. And then Pete--I'm not going to try.

(Pete Ofalini): (Pete Ofalini). And I would like to speak on the change in trail use.

Cheryl Essex: All right. Change of trail use. So we have seven John.

John Mercurio: Okay at this point, I'd like to also remind the folks all around that this matter that we're discussing now does not address any one particular trail. So if you're concerned about any one particular trail, you've heard that this means that some particular trail is going to have a change of use, that is not what we're doing.

So I would request that if that's your motivation for coming and speaking that this wouldn't really be the forum for that. So - but it sounds like we have seven so that'll mean we'll have two - we'll allow two minutes per speaker. And why don't we go ahead with the first one? Two minutes please.

Cheryl Essex: From Sacramento?

John Mercurio: Yes. That's the only place that has speakers. (Trina Romo).

(Trina Romo): Thank you. Good morning.

Cheryl Essex: Come up here please if you would so you can speak into the microphone.

(Trina Romo): Okay.

Cheryl Essex: Can I put you right here?

John Mercurio: Before it starts, you may find me telling you summarize and that means that you - you're approaching the two minute mark okay. So please just bear with us. We really need to move along and I don't mean any disrespect by that but I may say - to say summarize.

(Trina Romo): Thank you. Should I start?

Cheryl Essex: Yes.

(Trina Romo): Okay. My name is (Trina Romo) and although I belong to about nine different horse organizations, I'm really speaking as an individual and I'm delighted to be here so I look upon you people as sort of conservators of public safety.

And it's public safety, it's personal safety that I'm going to talk about today. Narrow trails are not safe for multi use. You have narrow trails, 15, 18 inches wide on one side. There's a straight mountain and a drop off of 2000 feet on the other side.

And if you are riding a horse and you meet bike riders, it's a very unsafe condition to be put in. Now there are just more and more bike riders out there and they need their own trails and they should have them.

But to put them on trail- on narrow trails used by hikers and horses is an invitation for disaster. It's not something that can be enforced even if we had additional park ranger people which we don't. It's just something that is not going to work.

I know it from a personal point of view. I've been on a narrow trail on a horse. The bike rider came around, fast around the corner, line of sight wasn't there. He couldn't see me even if he hadn't had to look where his front wheel was going. He felt bad I'm told. I'm told he waited until the helicopter came but I still had a broken back and a year's recovery. And this is just one incident of many that are going to happen if we put horses and bicycle riders on narrow trails. They deserve - the bike riders deserve trails too but it has to be on a wider basis. Please don't put us together. Please make that effort to keep us safe. And thank you so much.

John Mercurio: Okay thank you. And I want to make a request to the folks in Sacramento. When you clap it really...

Woman: It hurts.

John Mercurio: Please do not clap. Though you're really enthusiastic about the speakers and they're your friends and all that stuff. Please do not clap.

Cheryl Essex: Maybe raise your hand if you really agree with the speaker. How's that?

John Mercurio: Wave madly and smile broadly. All right?

John Mercurio: Speaker please.

Cheryl Essex: (Jerry Scribner).

Woman: Hello?

(Jerry Scribner): Hello. I'm (Jerry Scribner), president of the El Dorado equestrian trails foundation and I have a handout that those of you in the other locations won't be able to see. But you have already seen part of it, because it's a handout that includes pictures of a very appropriate multi use trail and those are the pictures that Jeannie, you used, in April of 2009 at the Trails Conference.

Jeannie Gillen: Oh good. Thanks.

(Jerry Scribner): When you did your workshop.

Jeannie Gillen: Thanks.

(Jerry Scribner): And then the second picture is a picture that was in the Sacramento Bee article exactly a year ago called, "Trouble on the Trail," about a local trail here which the State Department of Parks and Rec built for multi use.

Equestrians no longer ride it. And this article is about why hikers are no longer hiking it because this hiker was nearly run over trying to hike it because of the very heavy mountain bike use. And it just shows a mountain biker at about a 30 degree or 70 degree angle as he's whizzing around a trail.

And if - both of those pictures really are supported by the Wikipedia, if you look that up on the Internet about mountain biking. It's a wonderful sport. One of the speakers who will follow me is a mountain biker and an equestrian and many of our members do both.

But as the last speaker said, doing it on the same trail at the same time doesn't always work well unless it's a trail like Jeannie showed in the picture, which brings me to why I believe the committee should...

John Mercurio: I need you to summarize here.

(Jerry Scribner): ...yes - recommend that you start over on this PEIR process. It is not consistent. It's not objective. It's not uniform. And it's not clear. And I could give you a couple very specific examples. This trail here in Forest Hill should be one where you decrease the use. If you go through your evaluation criteria, there is no place for decreasing use because this whole thing was designed to add mountain bikes.

It would increase safety if you would say that that trail should be for mountain bikes only. They need a trail like that and they should have it. So increasing safety would be helped if you had a decreased use.

There's no uniform criteria on width. How are you going to implement this kind of (peer) process if one person says, "Well, two feet looks wide enough to me." The next district says, "Four feet would be fine." And the next district says it shouldn't be any less than six feet.

You need some specific criteria that should be uniformly enforced across the state.

John Mercurio: Thank you.

(Jerry Scribner): I just want to mention in our area within a mile of each other we have a trail just like Jeannie's that we all use. It works great for multi use. We have horse only trails on the El Dorado side. And then we have a motorcycle mark at (Mammoth) Bar and we have the mountain bike that I described that's a wonderful trail. They're all within a mile of each other and it works great. But multi use on all of those four places would not work. Thank you.

John Mercurio: Thank you. Next please.

Cheryl Essex: (Randi Hackforth).

(Randi Hackforth): Yes...

Cheryl Essex: Come over here.

John Mercurio: Another reminder it's two minutes please.

(Randi Hackforth): (Randi Hackforth), trail advocate. My concern with the PEIR is changing use again (implies) adding users to a trail system. My concern is that you're looking at width, speed, clearance, grade and erosion issues, safety top. What I like to do when I look at trails is look at multi use trail system, not a single trail with all users on the same track.

The example being the America River Parkway. It is a network of trails with different users that do not intrude on each other in a lot of locations. They have a few places where they cross but they don't intrude on each other's track.

Another issue is that when mountain bikes are allowed on trails that they continue to ride into other areas that are non-park areas following the track which is maintained privately. So signage - once these trails are converted we have issues of intrusion on to private property. Thank you.

John Mercurio: Thank you very much. Next please.

Cheryl Essex: That would be Donna Williams.

Donna Williams: Well, my name is Donna Williams and I'm here from Sacramento area. And I'm going to read what I actually had sent into - for this road and trail change in use and then add a few comments.

In regards to the road and trail change use plan placed on the table for solution, our continued two to three decade public conflict and lack of funding for trail maintenance is not the solution. Rather for - our choices for solutions have to come to the reality that bank - California's bankrupt. And I think it's over \$28-plus billion dollars right now we're set - and looking at.

And it doesn't - it's very questionable if the feds are going to bail us out. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission stated - and this is before - what they responded to in Orville for the trails up there - the order concludes that conversion of any existing project trails to share use for the remaining term is not warranted. To the contrary, maintaining trails within the project where used only by equestrian hikers offer a unique recreational experience worthy of preservation. In addition, shared user trails increases safety concerns, user conflict and necessitates additional trail maintenance and modification majors.

We're not now, and will not in the foreseeable future have public budgets to pay for trail maintenance (prone) to modifications that will be required for change of use on these trails.

The same applies to the public funding to provide adequate ranger or (unintelligible) public recreational trails. What you see already is you have the Superintendent of Folsom Lake who has to double duty with the rangers already.

So I'm just going to field this comment from my view. We already cannot maintain the trails and we're doing this right now. I just feel this is a lot of money to - and I applaud you for doing it but is this the time to be doing it when we don't have any money?

It should be, as far as I'm concerned, paid for management or maintenance for the state park trails that we already have in existence to keep them in good condition, have our rangers appropriately keep our parks in a safe area.

We need to do a reality based budgeting that promotes public involvement and finance prioritization. Our problems are a foundation that over the last 20 years have put in over \$1 million in...

John Mercurio: Summarize.

Donna Williams: We need time. I - let me re- go fast. We need to look at new solutions to maintain and enhance our recreational trail system. These solutions should enlist a creative inspiration to engender the general public to be volunteers and stewards of our recreational trails.

We need to look at a solution from a reverse - a diverse recreational community that can safely seek the enjoyment of our recreational trails, considering of development separate trails for limited use of mountain bikes and hikers and separate trails for limited use of equestrian hikers.

This could - each recreational trail individual the incentive and the reason to be stewards of our recreational trail and ensure their diverse recreational community.

There has been and continues to be a need for avenues to be developed to provide separate mountain bike trails and technical parks built by their specification for their trail recreations and stewardships, promoting these opportunities by reducing the timelines for CEQA and NEPA And I just feel like you're doing another layer of this.

And I - you know, I apologize and I know you're trying to get - but we have to look at how can we appreciate and we serve the public with the monies that you get. And to view that one size fits all does not fit our recreational ter- environmental diverse recreation.

I never worked all my life to be driving a (Hugo). We all want to do the same thing, fine. But I - the big question I have here is why has this come up? Is there a specific user that's requesting the change?

John Mercurio: Okay well thank you.

Cheryl Essex: Thank you.

Donna Williams: Okay. You're more than welcome.

Cheryl Essex: Dave Smith. And then Mark Ingleman after that.

Dave Smith: Hi. I'm Dave Smith. I'm from Auburn. I'm a horse rider and I belong to the Gold Country Endurance Rider's Association. And I'm going to make an assumption. And that assumption is that most of you are not horse riders and that most of you who are going to be making decisions on this know very little, if anything, about horses.

So I want to give you just a very thumbnail sketch about horses and about the way horses react. Horses are a product of about 30 million years of evolution. They react to a predator that they've had throughout that time. That predator was probably a saber tooth cat. Now if you look at a saber tooth cat if you could see one, you would find that it's about the same size as a bicyclist who's coming down the trail at about the same speed as the saber tooth cat.

Now these horses that we ride, a thousand pounds or more, are programmed to react very quickly. I mean, more quickly than (you) to that, what they perceive to be a threat coming down the trail. Now we all work very hard to train our horses to disregard that threat.

I know that when I come across a bicyclist and most bicyclists are very positive people that are cognizant of the threat that they've may impose. I get off my horse. I have my horse smell the bike. I have the horse walk around the bike.

This I do in order to train that horse. The problem is when, as Trina had said earlier, when that rider comes around that corner at 25 miles an hour or whatever he's hitting, and all of the sudden you're there and your horse is reacting and he is reacting quicker than you can react. And the problem is you're probably going to go off.

John Mercurio: I need you to summarize please.

Dave Smith: A summary here is I want you to consider this, that we're not talking about a mechanism here. We're not talking about a machine. We're talking about a live animal that is going to react in a way that can hurt people, that can hurt itself and I'm not talking about just the rider. I'm talking about the person coming around that corner.

We can all get hurt doing this. So I want you to be very careful when you think about combining these two uses. Right now I have no problem riding with bicyclists on jeep roads, that sort of thing. But you get on these narrow trails in the steep country that we ride in, it's a very dangerous thing. And I want you to think about that when you make the - your decision. So thank you now.

John Mercurio: Thank you very much.

Cheryl Essex: Mark Ingleman. Mark Ingleman's handing out a resume - statement. I'll post those on the Web site.

Mark Ingleman: My name is Mark Ingleman. I'm from Greenwood. And my background basically is I've done the western states hundred mile trail run. I've done the Leadville, Colorado hundred mile mountain bike ride. I've done the Tevis Cup hundred mile endurance ride. Then in 1997, Australia eco challenge.

I've basically got several thousand miles in each discipline - trail running, mountain biking and endurance riding on our trails - on California trails. My basic statement is mountain bikes and endurance riders are unable to share technical single track trails on the same day.

The only certainty that this sharing of trails will bring is that there will be physical and economic damage created. The only uncertainty is the extent of the damage. I don't know any mountain bikers that

ride technical single track trails who have not bumped handle bars or who have not run someone off a trail or have themselves been run off the trail.

On a technical single track trail with obstacles - sand, mud, bushes, blind corners, various speeds and abilities, sharing the trails and unfortunately the iPods and listening devices, collisions are inevitable. The difference between horses and mountain bikes is that horses don't bump, they jump, and technical single track trails and consequences which horses have a tendency to ignore.

There are no remedies that I'm aware of other than to keep the two disciplines separated on technical trails. Enforcement is not viable as much of the trails have little use, several miles from a main trail and not easily patrolled.

In all of my years of utilizing the trail system I have never seen an enforcement action with regards to mountain bikes but I've seen numerous mountain bikers bootlegging equestrian trails. With the new realities of the park system budgets, minimal enforcements that have been provided may well become truly non-existent. Thank you.

John Mercurio: Thank you for that. Is there anybody else?

Cheryl Essex: Let's see, three quarters of the room's waving. Pete Ofalini:

Pete Ofalini: Yes, I don't think I can talk about two minutes. Good morning. My name is Pete Ofalini. I spent 35 years in the insurance claim business and I was a corporate officer at two different insurance companies in California as the vice president of claims.

Over the last six years I've testified in both state and federal court as an expert in claims and have been involved in appellate court cases dealing with issues involving negligence.

Additionally I, along with a bunch of other people in this room, are also members of the Auburn State's Recreation District Voluntary Trail Patrol. And part of what our responsibility in the trail patrol is to make certain that we protect all the users from the potential dangers that inherently are found in single track trails.

And over the past 20 years, many of us have, in fact, cooperated with and committed volunteer time to make certain this occurs. Additionally, the 35 members of this volunteer trail control committee members have spent thousands of hours annually maintaining the trails, clearing the trails to make certain they're safe for everyone involved.

To suggest the - you can convert a single track trail to multi use knowing the inherent danger in the trail itself is not reasonable. In fact, while in California this - California Supreme Court ruled on a (unintelligible) a number of years ago, the inter - the exception to the ex- assumption of the risk (start) factoring involves intervening course. And frankly, I think that if you elect to change trails from single track to multi use for all users, you will expose potentially the state to an action involving (unintelligible) injuries because of intervening courses which would be changing those trails.

John Mercurio: I need you to summarize here. Your two minutes is up.

(Pete Ofalini): Now that you mentioned that, on the handout it said that the public comment was going to be 30 minutes and we have seven speakers at two minutes each, comes up to 14 minutes so I'm not entirely clear...

John Mercurio: We also have another public comment period at the end of the meeting that we have to factor in here too.

Pete Ofalini: All right. Well, the bottom line is I think you folks need to consider the inherent danger of changing trail use, the inherent risk to those of us who volunteer on the trails and most importantly the inherent exposure you will create for the state because the cause changes the assumption of the risk doctrine. That case by the way is Placer County which is up in the Auburn State Recreation District, the Supreme Court ruled on. Thank you.

John Mercurio: Thank you very much. Is there anybody else?

Cheryl Essex: About half people waving. That's it.

John Mercurio: Okay. Then why don't we bring it back to the committee members. Everybody still there?

Woman: Yes.

John Mercurio: All right. Good. Do we have any - well, would you like me to go sequentially around the state and ask for specific comments at this point that you would like included in the letter to Director Coleman? I could do that.

Cheryl Essex: Did you want to make a motion, John, to prepare a letter?

John Mercurio: Well I thought that was automatically in here but I'd be happy to make the mo- someone needs to make a motion that we should prepare a letter to Director Coleman.

Jeannie Gillen: John, before you do that, I would like to make a comment to the public comment.

John Mercurio: Sure. Go ahead.

Jeannie Gillen: As an equestrian myself, I - my number one concern is the PEIR effort to create consistency or expand use. That to me is critical. I need to know that before I can make a comment to the director. And then I do want to compliment that, you know, I've been hearing this and feeling this and experiencing this for the past ten years as a committee member and 20 years in total as an equestrian.

And I will say that it used to be pushed under the rug a lot - oh we can just change trails. Oh, superintendents can change trails however they think best. So I have to compliment that now that everyone has come out and spoken and attempted to address these issues realistically, I think a change of use survey was a big, big step for state parks to introduce and try and implement because now they really are hearing and listening to the concerns of the users that they were not aware of before.

So I think we've made some progress but I still want to know if the goal is consistency and change of use and heightened awareness of the needs of the users in change of use or whether it is just a goal to justify the expansions of trail use.

Maryanne Vancio: This is Maryanne. My understanding from past meetings and discussions of the trail use change and survey is that the change can be any kind of a change including eliminating and existing use and not just adding a use.

John Mercurio: Yes, this is John. I - that's my understanding as well. It's not a one way thing. It can be removing a use.

Maryanne Vancio: Okay, because I think there was a speaker that said that there was no provision in here for, you know, not including something, you know, getting rid of a use. But that's - but this is the document to do that. If there is, you know, public input for use on an existing trail that they feel is not compatible, a change in use survey can deal with that.

John Mercurio: Absolutely.

Maryanne Vancio: Right.

Jeannie Gillen: That was my understanding as well.

Maryanne Vancio: Okay.

John Mercurio: Okay so do I have a motion that a letter be - that the committee - that a committee member write a letter to Director Coleman?

Jeannie Gillen: Well yes.

John Mercurio: With recommendations.

Jeannie Gillen: John, I will make that motion and then we can leave it up, I guess, do we second, and then have more discussions.

John Mercurio: Yes. Do I have a second for that?

Man: Will there be public comments on that letter?

((Crosstalk))

John Mercurio: Okay, somebody just spoke. Can I - what was that again?

Bill Taft: Okay, this is Bill Taft from Western States Trails.

Woman: I think the question here - from the audience here is that they want to see the letter that we draft.

John Mercurio: I need some guidance from staff on this.

Wayne Breece: Well, the CRTC will be responsible if they choose to make this a letter for writing that and how they choose to make that is up to their discretion.

Cheryl Essex: It would be posted on the Web site to be certainly available to...

Jeannie Gillen: Yes, can't we start an outline today while we're together and then assign someone to finalize it - and for approval before...

John Mercurio: That is exactly what the idea is, to have a - to agree on a - on the points to be included in the letter and then to have one committee member write and sign the letter.

Man: Don't you want to review your public comments before you wrote the letter since you haven't seen them?

Wayne Breece: Well this is why we're having this meeting so that the CRTC can make their - can discuss it as a committee about what's going on and their thoughts on this process.

John Mercurio: Yes, this is a letter of our thoughts, how we feel about the PEIR and then a letter transmitting those thoughts to the director. That's what we're talking about here today.

Jeannie Gillen: Well this is Jeannie and I have to say that I don't feel completely prepared to do a letter today because I don't have the results of the workshop and there was another reason that just escaped me.

Man: ...park superintendents.

Jeannie Gillen: Oh that's it. Thank you. It was park superintendents. I just feel like it's being driven by staff in Sacramento. No offense but I just don't know how the park superintendents feel about this and they're the ones that are going to have to implement it and be charged with a lot of responsibility here and take the kickbacks from the actions that they take based on this recommendation going through the director.

So I don't feel prepared. I don't feel I've got enough information to support a letter.

Gregory Gandrud: This is Greg in Carpinteria. I think there's a lot of confusion. You know, I always appreciate hearing from the public and I know the committee's very, very sensitive to the conflicts on the trails and as most of you know I've been a very active member of the subcommittee to address user conflict as has Jeannie.

But I mean, really what we're looking at here, we're not here to discuss the change of use today. We're here to discuss the programmatic EIR and I think what we really should be looking at is in the PEIR what impacts are being addressed, what sort of mitigation is recommended for various impacts. It's not a question today of whether or not we like the change of use survey.

So before we decide to write a letter maybe we should focus our comments on the real subject at hand. So does anybody else feel the same way?

John Mercurio: Yes. Yes, Gregory, if you look at your agenda one more time, item Number 3, committee advice to the state park director about the scope of the programmatic environmental impact report. It's not whether you're in favor or not in favor of increasing uses on trails but rather to comment on the scope we haven't even prepared the PEIR yet. And that will have a review process as well.

This is going to go on for more than a year. So this is a very, very, very early part of the process and we're being asked to comment on a very limited aspect of this. So I would urge the committee members to continue on course and, you know, come up with some comments for the director.

Jeannie Gillen: Well I'm confused then because I thought the workshops were to introduce this PEIR and I - and again, I think a lot of this falls back on the superintendents so I don't see why having the results of that effort disclosed to us or shared with us in order to make our recommendation.

I mean, why did you have those scoping - or why did you have those workshops and why did you gather results?

John Mercurio: Well those will be - I guess those will be incorporated into the document, you know, in - going forward. And then we'll review that.

Wayne Breece: Jeannie, those were the opportunity for the public to comment about the scope. In other words, what should be included in that? What do you think should be included? This meeting has the same purpose (unintelligible). As a committee to say what do you think should be incorporated or put into the scope of this PEIR.

Jeannie Gillen: Okay. And don't we represent those people. Our superintendents and our users.

Wayne Breece: You have a statewide representation and this is your opportunity, your thought about what needs to be in this package.

Jeannie Gillen: So it's my personal opinion?

Wayne Breece: Or as a representative of - in this committee, your thoughts about you've been listening to public comment and you've been active working with trail groups. What do you think should be in this PEIR? What should be included?

John Mercurio: But didn't her constituency, where - part of the public forum, is what she's trying to get?

Jeannie Gillen: Those are independent.

Cheryl Essex: The workshops and the Web site, the written comments, we've asked the public to submit comments directly to the PEIR process. And the committee can act individually or they can act as a committee when they deliberate, of course saying they deliberate publicly which is what they're doing today to decide if the committee as a whole has substantial comments regarding the scope of the PEIR.

Wayne Breece: Again, since she's representing her constituency, she's going to have her decisions based on her constituency.

Cheryl Essex: The workshops are simply one avenue of people commenting. Constituencies of the members are much larger outside those workshops. Now, the workshop is not the only place for people to give comments.

((Crosstalk))

Jeannie Gillen: No, but my point is if you made - if you took the time to have workshops and people took the time to show up and make comments, I want to know what they had to say.

Cheryl Essex: Let's hear Gary address that as to, you know, how that works from a (unintelligible) standpoint.

Gary Walter: The workshops provide an opportunity for the public, at this stage, to provide input into fleshing out the scope of the document. So, for example, comments that you've heard from the public here today

primarily address safety issues with horses and, correct me if I'm wrong, but I heard potential mitigations or alternatives that could include things like having specific trails for mountain bikes.

Those are the kinds of things we're looking for when we scope the document so that we can analyze the impacts of those potential alternatives. In terms of the workshop, those are the public comments. I'm having the consultant prepare a catalog of them right now and we'll post them on the projects Web site ([http://www.parks.ca.gov/default.asp?page\\_id=26278](http://www.parks.ca.gov/default.asp?page_id=26278)).

But, you know, the intent of those wasn't to accumulate them to provide for a committee. The intent of those was to provide us who are preparing the document with - for the things that should be included in the scope of the document.

And this is for the environmental impact report for actions that result from the change in use process, okay. So it's the change in use process and those actions that we're identifying as far as impact to the environment.

Cathy Haagen-smit: Jeannie, Cathy. I'm just trying to understand whether you think that you're constituency hasn't had the opportunity to submit their comments all - like up until - during the public comment period.

Jeannie Gillen: No, I don't think that at all. I just - I wonder why...

Cathy Haagen-smit: Do you think they didn't get noticed, that they...

Jeannie Gillen: No, no, no.

Cathy Haagen-smit: November 30 was the deadline for comments.

Jeannie Gillen: No. What I'm wondering is that the workshop results have not been shared with us. That does concern me and the parks superintendent's opinions have not been shared with us. That concerns me. If we're going to draft and compose a letter that is so specific that is says to the director we are very concerned about user conflict on narrow trails between horses and bikes, if we're going to be that specific, okay, then I can go there.

But if we're just going to give a seal of approval to this project I can't go there.

John Mercurio: Jeannie, this is John. You know, just to kind of put it a different way, as Cathy said and others have been saying, the public has had a period to comment, in fact, longer then - much longer then is even required. So they've had their turn.

Now we get our turn and we get to do it through this method. So you should feel free to comment on how you feel about this because these are your comments, your constituencies, you have one, have had a chance to do it and as Gary said, those will all be put together so - into the document that's going to be prepared.

So these things are all happening. This is simply our chance to comment on the scope of the PEIR. And I think I - what I heard you say is you'd kind of like to have something in there about the committee is concerned about conflicts on trails and safety. So am I and I'd like to have that in there too. So can we maybe do that?

Jeannie Gillen: Yes, let's start. Let's see if we can make any progress on this.

John Mercurio: Yes, I think that's great. I think we're moving towards something here.

((Crosstalk))

Maryanne Vancio: This is Maryanne. I have a question for staff. Is this trail use change survey - already in use?

Wayne Breece: It has been used, yes.

Maryanne Vancio: Okay. So we're not really debating the trail use change survey because it's sort of been adopted and is being used. What we're trying to do is just come up with how we're going to address environmental issues as a result of the trail use change survey and those environmental issues that we want to address are being put forward in this programmatic EIR.

Wayne Breece: Right.

Maryanne Vancio: So we're really not debating the change in survey because that seems like that's already kind of a done deal.

Gary Walter: What we're looking for in the scope is our comments regarding Agent actions. And methods of assessment in terms of if you have comments on how we should be assessing potential impacts. As you know, some kind of protocol that can be used for assessing whether or not there's an issue at a given - on a given trail with safety or with erosion or with endangered species.

That's what we're looking for. If you have ideas in terms of mitigations, those are what we're looking for. This, for example, for observation - mitigation is, okay, make a different trail for bikers. Those are the types of things that we're looking for in this, to flush out the (unintelligible) of the environmental document not the change in use procedures.

Mark Ingleman: This would seem to take public comment. And in good faith, I know people have taken off work to go to these meetings and they thought their avenue to comment on this was the public forum. Without reviewing the public forum documents, they didn't say, "Hey, I'm going to call up and say - or send Jeannie." No, they said, "I'm going to the public forum because that is the avenue to make my comments."

And it doesn't seem that anybody reviewed those comments yet so how do you make those specific answers or recommendations without reviewing what people in good faith took time off work, spent their time and money, to give you those comments?

John Mercurio: Well, you know - this is John again. You know, we've heard the comment and now we're trying to come up with some points to put into a letter to Director Coleman. That's what we're doing and there was a public forum here and there has been a comment period before this and there are also other opportunities after this to also comment. There're still ways to do it in writing. So I'd like to move us along toward coming up with something to put in the letter.

Jeannie Gillen: So who wants to outline this letter because I just want to make sure it's not a seal of approval. It's - if it's specific, let's go. Let's do it.

John Mercurio: Well I - let me just throw something out there to get it going here. I have not - I've yet to hear any specific suggestions regarding the scope except for the deep concern that the committee has about safety on I guess narrow trails and that that be a prominent part of the review process.

Greg Gandrud: Excuse me John. I thought I heard a motion but I didn't hear a second.

John Mercurio: That's true. You're right. Thank you for reminding me about that. The motion was that a letter be prepared for Director Coleman. Is that correct?

Cheryl Essex: Yes.

John Mercurio: Okay, for way of review. Okay, do I have a second that we do that?

Jeannie Gillen: I'll second it.

Man: You can't... You made the motion.

Woman: Oh no, no. I'm thinking - it was a long time ago.

Gregory Gandrud: This is Greg in Carpinteria. I have to leave. I was hoping to leave at 11:30 so I will pass doing - I'd just like to say that I don't think we necessarily have to submit written comments but if we were, my main

concerns remain that there is way too much process involved in all of this. Objectivity is very, very important in any change of use.

I'm extremely concerned about trail safety. And I'm very aware of the conflicts between equestrian groups and mountain bike riders. I'm very concerned that equestrians are being forced off of the trails. So - and I also would support it at a future meeting discussing whether or not non-motorized trail use should be exempt under CEQA. Maybe there should be some state legislation to make it exempt.

So - but I don't feel that we have to send written comments at this point. If we don't have anything specific to say maybe we ought to just be quiet.

Jeannie Gillen: I would support that to the point of, I'm really not ready and I've told you why. I don't know how the superintendents feel about this and it hugely affects them. And I haven't seen the results of the workshop. So I don't feel we are prepared to write a letter and to do it in ten minutes is I think inappropriate.

John Mercurio: Thank you Jeannie. I have question. Can the chair second a motion?

Jeannie Gillen: No.

Cheryl Essex: I would think so. I can't imagine that a chair wouldn't be allowed to second - you're a member of the committee.

John Mercurio: I'll second the motion for the letter.

Maryanne Vancio: It sounds like we're not prepared to write a letter.

John Mercurio: Well, why don't we have a vote?

Maryanne Vancio: Okay.

John Mercurio: We have to see what the wishes of the committee are.

Jeannie Gillen: Is Greg gone?

Gregory Gandrud: Greg is still here but is preparing to depart. I'm going to leave at 10 - at 11:40.

Jeannie Gillen: Okay, stay for the vote please.

Gregory Gandrud: Okay.

John Mercurio: Okay let's do - I'm going to have to do a role call vote because we're in different places. Okay, in favor of the motion or not.

Cathy Haagensmit: At this point I'll have to say no.

Greg Gandrud: Well if I knew what the letter was going to say I could support the letter but because we have yet to reach any consensus at all in terms of what our concerns are at this point, I'm voting no.

Jeannie Gillen: No.

Maryanne Vancio: No.

David March: No.

John Mercurio: Okay and John, yes. Okay, so the motion failed. I'm at a loss here, sorry. Staff help me out here. What do we - now what do we do now? Move on to the next item, is that it? Are we done?

Cheryl Essex: You could talk about whether you wanted to take this up again at the next meeting.

John Mercurio: I know there is a time schedule for this, you know, how rigid is that? Can we - it would be my - if the schedule could accommodate us and allow us to delve into this a little bit more, but enlighten me. Can we do - put this on our next agenda?

Wayne Breece: Well, you want to discuss this more in your - the meeting that's proposed in January?

John Mercurio: Yes. That's what I'm asking. Can we do that? I think that's what the committee is interested in. Sounds like it.

Cathy Haagen-smit: Actually I'm not interested in that. I'm not sure the committee is going to come together on it.

Wayne Breece: We're not going to come to an agreement on it is what you're saying?

Cathy Haagen-smit: I'm not sure that we can draft a letter.

John Mercurio: We can find out when we put it on the agenda.

Jeannie Gillen: Yes, I think it should be continued to the next meeting.

John Mercurio: Yes.

Jeannie Gillen: This is Jeannie and I think it should be continued and I would be, you know, happy to craft something if I have additional input.

Maryanne Vancio: This is Maryanne. I think we need to continue it too. I think we need to have a position one way or the other.

John Mercurio: Yes. I agree. To just drop it, I mean, it sounds like - you know, that this is what we do, just trails and advising on trails and I, you know, it's - I'd like to make sure that we have exhausted all the possibilities of actually doing that, so...

David March: This is Dave. I'm wondering since we had this expedited meeting under the reason that it was urgent that we move quickly and had to get it done before the first of the year or whatever, I'm wondering if such a delay as we're talking about, up until late January is feasible.

John Mercurio: Well, I just asked that question and it sounds like we can continue the meeting.

Gary Waldron: Yes, well in terms of preparing the EIR, after the notice preparation, we compile all those comments and use those to flesh out the scope of the document. Once we have that document scoped out then we proceed on gathering the information that we need to prepare the document. So I will have to have the discussion with the powers that be in terms of delaying that aspect of preparing this for EIR.

John Mercurio: Okay thank you.

Gregory Gandrud: Chairman Mercurio and members of the committee, this is Gregory Gandrud. I'm leaving the meeting at this time. Thank you all very much. Have a great day.

John Mercurio: Thank you Greg. So if there's not - is there anything else on that item from staff or anybody else?

Cheryl Essex: No.

John Mercurio: Next on the agenda is Item 4, the 2011 recreational trails plan progress report.

Wayne Breece: This'll be short and brief. Have all of you seen the progress report, the piece that was sent out in the mail and also arrived in your email?

John Mercurio: Yes, I did.

Wayne Breece: Okay. This report is a - every two years we do a evaluation of the state of the 27 regional trails and make a progress report on that status of that. In June of this year we started out by sending a survey out to the

27 regional trail coordinators and had a series of questions we asked them about what's changed in your trails, what's progressed, how are things different. What are the challenges you're facing, who are the leaders in your trails, who - what's - basically what is going on with your trails, kind of a status report so to speak.

It took a while to gather that information because a number of trails do not have staff for the trails. They don't have people managing them and we had to dig hard and call people up and email people and gather that information.

We put that into a summary piece. In addition we went out and emailed them, called them and put that information together. And then we sent out a second survey which was basically to all kinds of trails users. We have a database of about 2500 or so people on this database.

We asked the questions basically about the goals in the - in our plan, our trails plan, and we got a lot of feedback. We had an enormous amount of member feedback, around 400 people responded back and said, "This is what's going on with our trails. This is what we're feeling about the goals." There're 12 goals identified in that plan. And it's a good measuring stick, a barometer if you will, of how are things really doing and how are people on the trails that are in the communities feeling about things.

And it's a lot of information. We haven't consolidated all of it yet but it's giving us a good feel for how trails are doing. So what we did, we put together a draft. We didn't finalize any of that information. And we presented it to you in this report.

It - the purpose of this draft is again to maybe get together and have a facilitation, a meeting about some of those 12 goals, discuss how are - how is California doing with the goals and what should we be focusing on, what would be - we be looking at. And not surprisingly the number one goal that people were most concerned about was funding.

And then we weighted each of those all the way down to 12 and some of them were, you know, not very much on people's radars at all. But again, it's your opportunity as a committee, then, to look at those goals and make an evaluation and give input to them and also maybe you are familiar with a specific trail, some progress on it or some event that's happened and if you wanted to give us input to that, we'd appreciate that.

It'll give us - enable us to give a well rounded report to the governor's office about the status of the trails in California. So that's, in a nutshell, what we've been doing and what we've been working on as a progress report. We're hoping in the conference in April to be able to present some of this information as a summary and also to show you - get your comments in that April meeting.

So I just wanted to turn it back over to the trails committee and ask did you have any comments or maybe you could either do that now or inviting later on to me about the progress reports.

John Mercurio: Okay Wayne. Thanks a lot. Thanks for the work on the report. Very, very, very, very interesting - and for your report right now. I also found the comments very interesting. There're so many of them. You're right. I mean, there was a great response to this and as you said, 80% - if I got - if I read this correctly, 80% say that funding is the number one concern. Is that right?

Wayne Breece: It's - yes, it's the number one issue. I don't have the figures in front of me but it - not surprisingly, funding is the issue and how do we overcome that and where can we go to get the money.

John Mercurio: Well, that's something maybe that we can discuss in the (spirit of) conference. You know, how do we attack the funding issue, both from a capital standpoint and an operations standpoint? Especially the latter.

So I guess we have a few minutes left here. If anybody has any substantive additions or comments on this draft. Now is the time. So anybody, go ahead.

Cathy Haagen-smit: John, this is Cathy in Sacramento. And I went out with - to my own email list and I just asked about the - what people I knew, what they thought about - or their thoughts on the - their state of their trails in their area and asked about the elements of the trails plan like the goals, if they had any comments.

And a lot of them did come back with work on specific trails that they were doing which was awesome. And some of them did provide comments about where their funding source was. So that would be a really interesting thing to see in April.

So I ended up with about six pages of trail updates and goal comments and they're all pretty awesome so what, you know, it would be crazy to go through them all here.

John Mercurio: No, and we can't do it and...

Cathy Haagen-smit: No, absolutely not. And so what I'm thinking is maybe everyone on the committee, if they've surveyed their trail leaders in their area to know what kind - if there are certain updates they have for the 27 trail corridors and to the goals of the trail plan. And then maybe be able to email them to staff.

Cheryl Essex: Absolutely.

Cathy Haagen-smit: So staff could have them. I know that a lot of the people I queried to also responded to the survey so the 400 or so replies that Wayne mentioned, they are reflected in the draft that we got. So awesome work and it'll be great to discuss it further and at the end of January and in April. That's it for me.

John Mercurio: Thank you. Now I have on substantive comment to make and then a whole bunch of kind of smaller stuff. But I'd like to make a comment right now and that is there's a trail called the Modoc Line. It runs from Eatonville to I think Alturas and it's not - it's an 86 mile trail and it's not in there. So I'd like to see that included.

Wayne Breece: Is it one of the trails on the 27 trails?

John Mercurio: It's not one of the 27. It used to be the 28th.

Wayne Breece: That's why we didn't include it because it's not in the - it's not in our piece.

Woman: Right.

Wayne Breece: And what you're asking, John, is a - how can we add another trail to our corridors?

John Mercurio: Right. Also the Bizz Johnson trail, a 26 mile trail. That's longer than some of the other trails in there. I believe that one also should be added as well. So those are the substantive comments that I had. And I will either talk or write my comments to you folks later.

Wayne Breece: Okay.

John Mercurio: Now does anybody else have anything - any comments on this?

Woman: If I could ask one question please. What I heard today was a huge focus on safety. Not funding. I heard funding as secondary. Safety in user conflict is primary. Where does safety fall in that list?

Cheryl Essex: You're welcome to review this. It's on the Web site. And you can provide some written comments to the - and questions to the committee if you'd like that we can answer in January.

Woman: Okay. I was referring mainly to what Wayne said that funding was primary. And what I'm hearing is not primary.

Wayne Breece: There were 12 goals mentioned in there and what I said in there was of those 12 goals, the number one issue that was most important was the funding.

John Mercurio: Okay. I'd appreciate it if we could have a chance for the committee members to weigh in here before noon. Let's see, Jeannie, anything?

Jeannie Gillen: Yes. I'm fine. I'm just listening to everybody.

John Mercurio: Okay. And Maryanne?

Maryanne Vancio: I'm good.

John Mercurio: And David?

David March: I'm fine.

John Mercurio: Okay so if you, you know, have a chance to look at it some more and you notice anything in there that you'd like to see different, feel free to give Wayne or Cheryl a call and we can chat about it or write about it or whatever. So great. Is there anything else on this item?

Jeannie Gillen: Yes, this is Jeannie.

John Mercurio: Yes.

Jeannie Gillen: And I just want to share with you all that the Anza Trail Foundation is up and running. I am president or chair or whatever of that foundation. We have money. We have a strategic plan online and I don't mean computer wise. I just mean we're working on our strategic plan for the foundation. So there's progress being made on the Juan Bautista de Anza national historical trail.

John Mercurio: Excellent. And it's so good news.

Woman: Yes, that is great. And so both Jeannie and John, one of the comments I received back on that Anza trail was the volunteers at Henry Coe State Park are definitely incorporating the Anza National Historic Trail in some current work that they're doing.

So that'll be part of my update. So congratulations Jeannie. And I think Greg is working on that too, so awesome.

Jeannie Gillen: Thank you.

John Mercurio: Okay, well thank you very much. I'm going to have to move this along now because I want to allow a little time for public comment on - although we have public comment on the progress report. So I'd like to open - see - is there anyone there that would like to make public comment on the progress report?

Cheryl Essex: Let me see. I still have Joe Larkin identified. Are you interested in speaking sir?

Joe Larkin: Oh no. I'm good. I'm going to give my two minutes to (unintelligible).

John Mercurio: And I also want to have a public comment period - we need to have a public comment on anything not on the agenda. So I've got about eight minutes to do two different public comments. But it sounds like no one wants to comment on the plan report. Do we have anybody who wants to make general public comments?

Woman: Do we have any - yes, we have Donna Williams wants to come back and say something.

John Mercurio: Okay very good. Go ahead please.

Donna Williams: Great. My name is Donna Williams and I want to bring in kind of what we seem to have happened here at these meetings that I've noticed. And I happen to do a lot with a little public county park and I feel that they really need to have an input to what we're talking about, to a conflict here and carrying capacity on these to as to what kind of environmental damage would ensue by putting too many (unintelligible).

We have a majority now becoming the public that are older people that need safe places to be able to walk and to hike. And there's a survey that's just come out that 55-plus people are back to work and wanting to stay healthier and that they actually report are doing better than the people from the ages of 18 to 26 that are actually employed.

So what it tells you, is you have a whole group here that we need to understand need to have safe trails they can walk on. And this puts into perspective where I see people who leave a trail that's multi use and will drive miles where to be on a specific limited use hiking and equestrian trail.

And I've seen that happen. The local people do the same thing. I spoke to a couple of gentlemen who were in their 70s and I can equate that because I'm in that age group practically - getting there, close. And their comment when we were talking about being able to have rangers and being able to have - maintain trails is that there was no accountability out there.

So I think we really have to keep that in perspective. We're actually talking about trail use, changing use. So how can we do this, an event to benefit everyone? When you look at the older generation, we normally vote. We normally have more of a discretionary budget. And a lot of us are volunteers.

You can see people that have come here. So you want to ingratiate that group in order to give them material opportunity to be out there and walking because there're a lot, whether there's a birder or scout leaders go out there. And, you know, all these people that go out there and walk and hike the trails, we need to - even though they're not represented right here at the trail, we need to realize that that's a really large group out there that we have to have them have safe trails too, so.

Cheryl Essex: Thank you.

Donna Williams: With our people in our group, it is so important. Well, I guess I'm here. Thank you.

John Mercurio: Very good. Thank you very much for coming and for making that comment. Anybody else?

Cheryl Essex: Not from Sacramento.

John Mercurio: Okay. Anybody else in the far reaches of California? No. Okay. And there's no one here on Mt. Diablo besides me in this room - and the view. Okay wow. I can rub that in.

John Mercurio: The next item on our agenda is regarding the next regular meeting of the California Recreational Trails Committee. It's held in the Palm Springs area January 26 and 27th, 2011. I look forward to seeing all you folks again.

Maryanne Vancio: Hey John, this is Maryanne. I know we were surveyed about taking the tram up the San Jacinto mountains which I think is a wonderful idea. But just, you know, it does snow up there in the end of January.

John Mercurio: I've seen snow in Palm Springs in January.

Maryanne Vancio: Yes. Yes. So that would be my only concern. As much as I would love to take the tram, and, you know, and - but I think we need to have a - keep that as maybe as a tentative pending on weather.

John Mercurio: Okay understood. Yes.

Jeannie Gillen: John, this is Jeannie. And the tram trip is for our pleasure. We're not holding our meeting up there are we?

Wayne: No.

Jeannie Gillen: Okay.

Cheryl Essex: We could very well hold our meeting up there. It's a really credible example of connecting an urban tourist area to a wilderness area.

Jeannie Gillen: No, Cheryl, the reason I asked is because I've done that before with Riverside County and that limits public participation so that's why I asked.

John Mercurio: We can't do that. It costs a lot of money to go up there.

Jeannie Gillen: Yes.

John Mercurio: And it - have the money to get up there then you're effectively eliminated because the other way up there is way around the other way, you know, the driving way is pretty long.

Jeannie Gillen: And the road might not be open. So that was my point. I just wanted to make sure we were not limiting public attendance by having our meeting up there. I don't think that's right. And speaking of that, I wanted to thank everyone that did take the time to come participate in our meeting today.

Cheryl: We have hand waving here.

John Mercurio: I echo that sentiment as well. So with - if there's nothing else, this meeting is adjourned.

END

NOTE: This transcript has not been checked for accuracy against the audio recording of the meeting and is therefore not to be used as an official record. The minutes of the meeting constitute the official record. This transcript is provided as a courtesy only. Passages may be inaccurate, and names of places and people may be misspelled. This transcript shall not be quoted without first verifying the accuracy of the transcription against the audio recording of the meeting and confirming the information with the California Department of Parks and Recreation.